

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 5-9, 12, 13, and 16-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are independent.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 6-8, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings are accepted.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

CLAIMS 1 and 5

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,972,951 (Vartanian). Further, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vartanian in view of JP 2003-236953 (Nakajima). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements. Applicants respectfully submit

that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by Vartanian.

Vartanian is directed to a tray for video tape, which has a recess 20 in the bottom section that provides additional space to accommodate for various types of video tapes. In particular, Vartanian teaches a stepped down bottom 18 having an elongated recess 20 (col. 2, lines 17-20).

The present invention is for accommodating large substrates, for example having a length of 1.3 m or greater and weighing about 5 kg (specification at page 4, lines 10-12). Applicant submits that Vartanian would not be a suitable structure for accommodating the large substrate that is the subject of the present invention.

In order to clarify the differences over the tray for video tape of Vartanian and the display substrate accommodating tray of the present invention, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the bottom section supports a display substrate on at least a portion of a planar top surface of the bottom section in a vicinity of the center of the display substrate and that the display substrate contacts at least a portion of the bottom section in the vicinity of the center of the display substrate.

Applicant submits that Vartanian does not teach or suggest at least this claimed feature as amended.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Vartanian's teaching of a bottom having an elongated recess 20 teaches away from the claimed invention. As disclosed in column 2, lines 23-27, Vartanian discloses that "the reason for the stepped down configuration 18 and the recess 20 is so that additional space will be available for a specific type of video tape so that the tray 10 can accommodate the widest variety of different types of video tapes." The present invention, on the other hand, teaches contact with the display substrate in order to provide maximum support. Applicant submits that if the invention of Vartanian were to be modified to provide support at a vicinity of the center of the display substrate, then there would not be a recess that would enable accommodation of the widest variety of different types of video tapes.

Instead, Applicant submits that the structure including the bottom having an elongated recess 20 of Vartanian would not be capable of providing adequate support for the glass substrate of the present invention. As mentioned above, the currently amended claimed invention is

disclosed as being for use with large substrates (e.g., side length of 1.3 m or greater and weighing about 5 kg; specification at page 4, lines 10-12). To the contrary, the structure in Vartanian would likely result in bending and breaking of the large glass substrate that is the subject of the present invention.

In addition, claim 1 requires “a flange-like engaging section, protruding externally from walls of said frame in a substantially horizontal fashion, to be engaged by a carrying section for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.”

The Examiner states that Vartanian teaches “the tray includes a flange-like engaging section (42) protruding externally from walls of the frame in a substantially horizontal manner.”

Applicant submits that although ledge 42 may protrude externally from walls of ledge 16, ledge 42 would not accommodate carrying the tray. As can be seen in Fig. 2 of Vartanian, ledge 42 is an upper surface that is defined by indentation 36. Applicant submits that the ledge itself would not be accessible for engagement by a carrying section in either arrangement in Fig. 2 or Fig. 3.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that ledge 42 of Vartanian does not teach the claimed flange-like engaging section to be engaged by a carrying section for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray. Applicant submits that a ledge, by definition, is an upper surface and thus, cannot be used for carrying the tray.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by Vartanian, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claim 5, Applicant submits that claim 5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claim 5 is allowable based on its dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 9 and 12

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vartanian in view of U.S. Patent 6,116,427 (Wu). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vartanian in view of Wu and Nakajima.

Claim 9 recites among other things a feature that “a plurality of openings are formed in the bottom section.” Otherwise features discussed in the above for claim 1 are also recited in claim 9. Applicant has amended claim 9 in a comparable fashion to claim 1. Subsequently, arguments in the above for claim 1, apply as well to claim 9. In addition, Applicant submits that claim 12 is allowable for its dependency on claim 9.

Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs**, Registration No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: March 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down #48222
Charles Gorenstein Robert Down
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000